

there, supposedly to stimulate the economy. All of them voted for the tax increase. The tax increase was the 1993 tax increase that President Clinton had. It was characterized as the largest single tax increase in the history of public finance in America or any place in the world, and those are not the words of conservative Republican JIM INHOFE. Those are the words of PATRICK MOYNIHAN, who at that time was chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

Further down here they all had either D or F ratings by the National Taxpayers Union. In other words, they were the big spenders, and those are the ones who were defeated. They are not here. Look around. They are not here.

In the House of Representatives, 66 of them went out. Almost all of the 66 voted yes on the stimulus bill, voted yes on the tax increase, and had a D or F rating by the National Taxpayers Union.

So I just suggest to you, Mr. President, that we make it abundantly clear to the liberals in Congress, the few liberals who are left, because most of them were wiped out in the November 8 revolution, there is going to be another wave coming up in 1996, and this is the opportunity for us to be fiscally responsible, for us to be able to stand up and say no to some of these useless programs that have outlived their usefulness and say yes to future generations, including my two grandchildren, Glade and Maggie Inhofe. This is what is going to work for America, and this is probably the centerfold of the revolution of November 8.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I understand that the parliamentary situation is that we are in morning business; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Technically speaking, the Senate is on H.R. 1158.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, if no one else is seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as though in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMOVING THE ANTITRUST EXEMPTION FROM MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust, Business Rights and Competition of the Committee on the Judiciary voted out S.627, the Hatch-Thurmond-Leahy bill clarifying the application of our antitrust laws to major league baseball.

What we did was to remove the antitrust exemption given to major league baseball. I hope that the full Judiciary Committee, the Senate and the other body will take this up and pass it relatively soon.

Baseball has for decades had a special exemption from the antitrust laws, which laws apply to everything else, every other business in this country and every other professional sport. What this means is that baseball and those who own it and run it are basically above the law.

Now they have shown what this means. They have shown great disdain for the fans, for those who do not make the \$1 million salaries, like the people who park the cars, that sell peanuts and beer and hot dogs and soda at the various stadiums, for the communities that have taxed their people through bond issues to build stadiums, for those who make the pennants and the T-shirts and the baseball caps, and even, in the State of Vermont, those who make the souvenir bats given out on bat day. Such people have been out of jobs over the past year because of the baseball strike.

And throughout all of this, people, some acting in extremely high-handed fashion, are able to say, "Well, the fans be damned. Because we have this exemption from antitrust, we can act together. We can do whatever we want."

The antitrust exemption was provided for baseball on the assumption that those who control baseball would act in the best interest of the game and the best interest of the fans, would do it responsibly and that we would have a strong commissioner. The practical matter is they have done none of this in the last few years.

I recall testimony in a hearing that Senator THURMOND and I had in which the question was asked: Let us assume baseball did not have an exemption from the antitrust laws and let us assume we saw the situation, the sorry situation, we have seen for nearly a year in baseball. If the owners came in and said, "Oh, by the way, Congress, give us something you have not given any other business. Give us an exemption from the antitrust laws." Would they not be laughed off Capitol Hill? Of course, they would.

Republicans and Democrats alike, both in the Senate and the House, would say, "We are not going to give you that. We are not going to give you this special exemption from the antitrust laws that we don't give to football or basketball or General Motors or Dow Chemical or Monsanto or Apple Computers or anybody else. We are not going to give it to you. And especially we are not going to give it to you because of the way you have been acting."

We would not pass a statutory exemption, and I daresay, Mr. President, there would not be one Member of the U.S. Senate that would vote to give them an antitrust exemption today, yet they have it.

So, I hope, by the same token, everyone in the Senate will join with Senator THURMOND, Senator HATCH, and myself—an interesting coalition, if ever there was one—and would withdraw the antitrust exemption. It is not deserved by baseball. It should not be continued for baseball. They should be treated as anybody else.

Their behavior in the past year has shown why they should not have that special exemption, if they ever really deserved it. But whether they have deserved it or not, they have now lost it. We should take it away.

So, Mr. President, I hope that this legislation will work its way through the committee process fairly quickly, come to the floor of the Senate, and be voted upon.

I have watched some of the activities of the baseball teams, I mean things that are so petty, so petty. For example, the way they treat Little League teams.

When I was a youngster and when my children were, the idea was, if you had a Little League team, you built up some following for various teams. You proudly wore the logos of a team—the Red Sox, the Yankees, whoever else it might be.

Now they say: "Well, we will require each one of those children to pay us \$6 for the privilege of having their logo on their uniform." This is just penny-ante baloney.

What it does, it says, "We expect you to be fans supporting us, but, kid, you're going to pay for it."

I recall as a child being at Fenway Park and seeing some of the greats of baseball come by. If you held out a baseball, they would autograph it for you. And they were paid a tiny fraction of what is paid to these multimillionaires today who tell you, "Yes, you can come in and for x number of dollars we may give you the autograph." This is spoiling the whole idea of baseball.

So, as I said, Mr. President, we ought to lift their antitrust exemption. They do not deserve it. They never really earned it in the first place, and they have done nothing to keep it today. Let us get rid of it. Let us treat them as the business they have become and let us stand up for the fans for a change.

I have seen a situation in the hearings where even the acting commissioner of baseball in his testimony tried to mislead the Senate; gave conflicting testimony, gave testimony that turned out not to be true; and did not move to correct his testimony. This is the kind of disdain that they show for the Congress.

Well, then let us not give them the exemption to the laws. You can have disdain for the laws, you can have disdain for the game, you can have disdain for your own responsibilities, you can have disdain for your own fans, but we are not going to give you a special

exemption under the law to carry out that disdain.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BUDGET BALANCING IS A THREE-STEP PROCESS

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, I wanted to comment on two things, one which has just occurred and one which is about to occur, I hope. We know that last night the House of Representatives passed historic tax relief for the American people. I want to address that for a moment.

Second, we know there have been discussions between the majority and minority leader on an attempt to reach an agreement on a rescissions package which we could conclude before the Easter recess.

Mr. President, the House of Representatives adopted a rescissions package of about \$17 billion and the Senate has been working on a package somewhat less than that. It is our hope between the majority and minority we can come to an agreement on a package which would represent our effort to meet the House, if not precisely their figure, at least something close to it so that as the House and Senate take the recess during the Eastertime, our constituents back home would know that both the House and Senate were serious about saving money.

Mr. President, during the last campaign, as I was running for this office, people asked me what it would take to balance the budget? I said it is a three-step process.

The first thing we can do is immediately try to save some of the money that the Congress has already appropriated. We know that every year there is money appropriated that really cannot be spent very effectively. If we could make a head start on balancing the budget by just saving some of that money for next year, it would demonstrate our commitment to a long-term goal of balancing the budget.

That is what the rescission package is about. I will come back to that in a moment. The second step, of course, is the decisions that we make throughout the year for that year's budget. The third step, of course, is the long-term balancing of the budget process which I have contended can only be done effectively through the adoption of the balanced budget amendment, because without the discipline of the constitutional requirement to balance the budget I have always felt it doubtful Congress would actually develop the willpower and the commitment to see that difficult project through.

Those are really the three steps that I articulate.

In the second step, what I had said was each month throughout the legislative year we deal with legislation that spends money. We can make the conscious decision not to spend as much, to limit Federal spending. When it comes time to appropriate the funds, we can set priorities and we can end passing appropriations bills that limit the growth in Federal spending.

Mr. President, we have heard the figures that if we adopt a tax relief plan for the American people we can still balance the Federal budget by the year 2002 if we limit growth in Federal spending to 2 percent a year. We are not talking about draconian cuts, but talking about limiting the growth in spending.

So the first step is to try to save money that we do not have to spend next year through a rescissions bill. The second step is to make the tough additions each week, each month, as this year goes by, as we pass the appropriations bills, to spend less money than we had anticipated spending.

If we do that each year for 7 years, we will have achieved a balanced budget by the year 2002, without the need for a constitutional amendment.

We know that would provide more discipline, would give the Congress a better ability to control spending, but we will deal with the issue of the constitutional amendment later this year and probably next year.

Let me go back to the first of those three steps, the rescission package, because that is what has been before the Senate for the past week.

The idea of rescissions—not a term that the American people would necessarily relate to—but the idea of rescissions is to simply not spend money that we counted on spending, because we really do not have to spend it.

Here is an example: We appropriate money to the General Services Administration to build a building. We say it will cost \$2 million, so here is the money for it. GSA lets out the bids but none of the companies that would bid on it gives the GSA a bid they want to accept. The bids do not supply the right kind of construction or architect or something.

So the GSA does not let the bids for the contract, so the contract is delayed a year. That \$2 million which has been appropriated for next year, really, cannot efficiently be spent next year. The construction project on which it was supposed to be spent cannot be built.

Why should we force the GSA to spend that money on something? We can rescind the money. We can call that money back, and save it for this year, and either decide to apply it to deficit reduction or apply it to some other expenditure for next year.

There are a lot of different programs that we have been talking about rescinding money in. The net result has been an agreement that somewhere between \$13 or \$14 billion and \$17 billion,

we can save the American people—taxpayers—that much money in this coming fiscal year because we really do not need to spend that money even though the money has been authorized to be spent.

Now we have had some disagreements in the Senate about whether we should agree to the House level of \$17 billion. There has been some disagreement between the Democrats and Republicans as to where to save that money.

I am hopeful that within a few minutes the majority and the minority leader will announce an agreement which represents not totally a Republican view or a Democratic view but a view that both share, that we need to save as much money as possible.

While it will not get to the \$17 billion level that the House of Representatives has adopted, it will be close to that. It will be in the range of \$16 billion, I hope, and that we will then be able to quickly adopt that rescissions package, go into conference with the House so that as soon as we return from the Easter recess we can send to the President savings of between \$16 and \$17 billion.

Some people have said, why are we taking time to deal with that problem when we have a much bigger problem of developing a budget of over \$1 trillion? Beginning the process of reducing Federal spending over a period of 7 years to reach a balanced budget, perhaps in the order of magnitude of \$1 trillion over the 7-year period.

What is \$17 billion? Well, we have all quoted Everett Dirksen, who use to speak in this Chamber, and who made famous "A billion here and a billion there, pretty soon you are talking real money." To the American people, \$17 billion is a lot of money, and it is a very good downpayment on the savings that we have to make in the future.

Because of the consternation I have seen expressed on the floor here about some of the savings even within the \$17 billion package, it makes it clear to me that it will be a very hard process if we cannot agree to some of the things that are in the \$16 or \$17 billion package, how will we agree to something 10 times greater than that or 100 times greater than that?

Clearly, we have to start from the bottom up. Each program has to be prioritized, and we have to try and find savings everywhere we can. In each line of that Federal budget, there is something to be saved. When we add it all up, it adds up to big dollars.

If we only look to the big programs, then we are forced to look at things like Social Security and Medicare and defense. Frankly, most Senators understand that there is much about those programs which precludes the Senate from making the huge savings that would have to be made there if we ignore the smaller programs.

It is important to start at a level of rescissions. I am very, very hopeful that within a few minutes our leadership will indicate an agreement on a